

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

Spring 1-28-2013

## 2013-01-28 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2013-01-28 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2013). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 10.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins/10](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/10)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

## **Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)**

**Date:** January 28, 2013

**Location:** LTC Forum

### **Present:**

Dominic Sanfilippo, SGA

Don Pair

Fred Jenkins

Jennifer Creech

Jim Dunne

Juan Santamarina

Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch

Leno Pedrotti

Riad Alakkad

Scott Schneider

Elizabeth Gustafson

Becki Lawhorn

Jarred White, SGA

Keri Brown-Kirschman

### **Absent:**

Sawyer Hunley (jury duty)

Joan Plungis

John White

### **Announcements:**

- Welcome back to Keri Brown-Kirschman

### **Approval of Minutes:**

- Approval of 12/3 minutes
  - moved for approval by Becki, Don pair second motion – all present in favor.

### **Update on CIM:**

- Update by Jennifer – submitted last wave of revision; will send link out with final version and will move forward from there. Timeline not yet determined – should be soon after final revisions.
  - Leno asked if it makes sense to hold off on submissions
  - Don would like to be able to announce on Friday that the system is ready if possible or have a solid update
    - Jennifer provide expected date before Friday, 2/1.

### **Discussion Items:**

- **Revision of Section 4.8 in CAPCC Procedures Document**
  - The CAPCC procedures were approved with the exception of 4.8 in the fall. Last time we met we agreed to discuss this section
  - Jim and Leno created a rewrite of 4.8 and a possible electronic review process/procedure.
  - Related notes from APC were distributed
    - Rewrite is from Leno not directed by the APC
  - APC questions on distributed notes were reviewed
    - Effective date concern about possible delay in course actually being offered after approval; course could only be run once or twice before needing to be up for review again.
  - 5 year proposal is just as a starting point for discussion since we proposed 3 years initially and there was some question.
  - Proposed revision was shared.

- Discussed reason for adding B) since the options exist to keep or review, there needs to be that option
    - If A) is chosen there is still a means of communicating changes in structure (minor)....versus C) if there is a major change
  - KKW: do we need to define minor/major changes?
    - LP: leave to department; more to communicate changes in delivery, etc.
    - JD: A) states course continues to meet SLOs and CAP Component(s) in same manner
- Two scenarios: intent is to change; or, course has drifted over time...
  - Even if drifted it may need to continue to be taught so that it is available to students who need it to meet requirements.
- Do we need language regarding what happens if deadline is missed? Must repeat review process...gives them another year? Trying to avoid disruption.
- Confirming that the review driver is the department – not CAPCC
  - CAPCC notifies department that a review is needed
  - The review timetable initiates the review
    - CAPCC department does not initiate a review based upon any feedback.
- Perhaps we need to know what the Assessment committee recommends
- What about something that comes to our attention??
- This process can be changed in the future, informed by the assessment process
- **Review Time Frame Discussion:**
  - Do we need to act on this now, since we have a timeline of three years as it is now, is there merit on holding off on this until program review and info from assessment committee?
    - DP there may be value in checking in w/ UAC to see where they are to inform 4.8.
    - It is believed Sawyer prefers to complete this document and prefers 3 years to 5.
    - Maybe include a statement of intent...what we initially believe the period of approval will be noting it could be revised.
    - Juan recommends settling on something now as most proposing courses now may believe that there is no review period (similar to gen ed)
      - We should add disclaimer that these guidelines may change but that we should arrive at some sort of guidance for now.
    - What if we had a 5 year review period but then the assessment piece refines and we determine that the courses approved have issues...
      - DP: if we decide 5 years, then change to 3 that is not a positive adjustment. Maybe better to approve a shorter time frame and make it longer in the future if deemed appropriate.
      - Option - state that periodically departments will need to recertify courses. The time frame will be decided upon after the initial 2 year comprehensive review of CAP.
  - In CIM, courses approved do not go into the catalog until the next catalog year, although it can be taught before. Need to arrive upon a standard point of time when the review timeframe begins.
  - If department certifies – CAPCC does not have to be involved in a review.
    - Department course review could easily be overlooked and get in a vicious cycle
    - Should it be more specific who within the department is responsible for review? JS...department chair responsibility.

- Discussed that we do not need to know the reason for B).
  - Committee members agree to remove C). Move some detail from the form to the policy rewrite.
  - The effective start date of the review time frame should be the date of the catalog in which the course first appears
  - We will know much more in four years about meaningful ways to review; assessment data will be available to inform the process.
- **Summary of Procedure Document Discussion:**
    - Remove C)
    - Review timeframe starts from date of the catalog year first time the course is listed as approved for CAP
    - No agreement on 3 or 5 years...maybe 4 years?
    - Considering putting in place a detailed statement of review until after first program assessment of CAP in two years?
    - Leno will let APC know we need more input from UAC at minimum
      - APC meets next in two weeks.
- **Other Discussion:**
    - Leno confirmed that CAPCC reporting to APC is sufficient via overlap members.
    - Confirmed all are in agreement with the course review process.
    - Juan will draft a script for used at the approval meetings to drive the process within the allotted time, so that it is done the same way every time.
    - Next two meetings/weeks we will do course reviews: 2/4 CMM 100, 2/11 HST Capstone and ENG proposal

**Next Meeting:** Monday, February 4, 2013, 3:00PM